THE TRIAL OF REPUTATIONS

Twenty-Ninth Day of the Great Scandal Case.

TILTON STILL ON THE RACK.

Investigating the Tripartite Covenant Question.

LIVELY LEGAL SALLIES.

Reading the Fascinating Pages of the "True Story."

It was reasonable to think the very unpromising weather of yesterday would diminish the usual attendance at the Tilton-Beecher trial. The surlosity to be present was hardly considered so ntense as to make people disregard the rain for the sake of sitting in the dim cathedral light of the court room to listen for four hours to an unprofit. able cross-examination. Yet elbow room was again at a premium. The course of the cross-examination was less smooth than on the previous day. It had hardly begun when the lawyers fell to rangling Mr. Evarts, as usual stirring up the legal mastiffs of the opposition until a chorns of growls filled the chamber. The deep, steady bass of the Judge interposed with less effect than on former occasions, but getting restive under the aggravating persistency of Evarts he summarily put an end to the scene by a determined de-

for the defence is not easily baffled. He gives and skes clows with the nonchalance of a trained fighter. He has no sanguineous impulses to reto impel him to angry resentment. The case is different with the counsel for the plaintiff. The enimal instinct of unreflective combativeness is here highly developed. When Fullerton fings a retort at Evarts, the blood mounts above his shirt collar. When Beach is nettled he changes from a carnation pink to a turkey crimson. The pallid face of Evarts remains the same in sunshine and in storm, yet it drops from the gravity of death to the mirth of Momus without change

The audience find in these legal tilts the great eward of their patience. Could they have their own way they would so apportion their applause as to stimulate the actors to more exciting confiets. For ten long days Mr. Everts has stood along amid a waste of auxiliary lawyers fighting the case of the defence with rare skill and pertinacity. When attacked nobody comes to his assistance. Shearman metaphorically hides his head. Tracy hesitates, Judge Porter's amiability restrains him battle. Not so with the plaintiff's side. When Fullerton lorgets a point or fails to make the most of weat he has in hand, Beach rises like a mentor behind and supplies the omission, and when Beach is in the toils Fullerton comes to his relief with promptitude and vigor. In sporting phraseology they are "a powerful team." What the one lacks the other contrives to jurnish. Fullerton excels in quickness. Beach in shrewdness. the prepossessions of the jury; the latter, in strength of legal equipment and common sense imposes his convictions upon the Court. No more admirable combination could have been made. The subordinate counsel are in harmony with the leading parts, and the service as a whole is per-

The developments of the day were not of much consideration. The plans of the defence revealed ingenuity. Practised hands had evidently labored on the line of cross-examination. The witness,

however, held his own.

THE TRIPARTITE COVENANT,
signed by Beecher, Bowen and Tilton, made the subject of the early cross-examination. The purpose of the defence was to show that Tilton, who was at first enthusiastically disposed to sign the paper, besitated on the advice of Moulton, and finally signed it only when been amended to suit bimself so him free to relate the scandal if he pleased at any future time. In connection with this the defence aimed to make tingent on the payment to Tilton of \$7,000, the amount decided upon by the arbitrators in the case of Tilton's contracts with Bowen.

AFTER THE RECESS
the "true statement" was read by Mr. Evarts, sentence after sentence, the witness being asked to identify each to the best of his ability. It was a long, long story, the original of which was supposed to have been destroyed by Mrs. Tilton. The reading was interspersed with debates between the lawyers as to the manner in which the witness should answer. On his behalf it was insisted that he should not be compelled to give a remembered writing this sentence and that. The Judge instructed him in the way he should reply, and thenceforth the proceedings moved on with greater calm and regularity. "Did you say to Plymouth church if the hypocrites who composed the congregation did not come to your terms?" was one of the remarkable questions put to the witness. It caused a decided flutter in the neigh. faithful sheep of his fold were gathered together in a spirit of meek resignation. The witness paid nothing of the kind, and this to the Philistines was a great disappointment. There was that it was thought the witness, for the sake of the parmontes demanded by poetic justice, should Johnson, according to Mr. Titton, who gave utterance to this terrible determination. That Oliver Johnson should be the tareatened Nemesis of Plymouth church puzzled many and gave rise to varied speculations.

PART OF THE DRAMA. The ladies attracted little notice. They have become so identified with the proceedings that their presence provokes no more observation than that of the policeman at the door. To an object of anxious inquiry. Not conspicuous by ber bulk or neauty, she is easily detected of late. ders. During the reading of the "true statement"-a paper hardly fit to introduce in temale circles-a young lady of attractive appearance was noticed perched upon a table at a side entrance, straining her beautiful, swan-like neck to catch the matter of the story.

THE WOODHULL AGAIN.

The counsel once more reverted to the Woodbull. What was the latest hour of the night witness spent in her company? The answer was sleven o'clock. Then followed from the witness an account of the house in which Mrs. Woodhull ived. It was bare of furniture from top to botlom, except one apartment, in which the lady lived. The prosecution of this line of inquiry soon ceased. It was said in court that Keady, of Beecher's counsel, was absent two days. Keady is the Newman Noggs of the trial, and when he withdraws his presence for so long a period important things are expected. It was whispered that he was seeking for the Woodhuil, that she was in town and eager to testily for the defence; that she left in "hot water." with her and never in any other, and that if her desire to give evidence was disappointed she would publish her side of the story at

MRS. BEECHER appeared to take more than ordinary interest in the proceedings. She was particularly concerned in that portion of the "true statement" that referred to her as "another abnormal person," like unto Mrs. Morse, the mother-in-law. During the reading she whispered to her husband, who reddened greatly in the face. Mr. Beecher spent much time in the perusal of a paper that looked like the Christian Union, taking his eyes off occasionally to glance at Mr. Evarts.

much time in the perusal of a paper that looked like the Christian Union, taking his eyes off occasionally to glance at Mr. Evarts.

The cross-examination of Theodore Tilton was resumed shority after eleven o'clock by Mr. Evarts. He handed witness a book and said:—We were speaking, Mr. Tilton of the transaction of the tripartite agreement, about a previous drait, differing from the actual paper. You have no copy of that drait as you have said. Look in this printed book and see if you recognize that as the draft that was replaced by the actual paper? A. (Witness looking at the book) i couldn't say whether the was the original draft or not; it purports to be; I can't say it is not or that it is.

Q. Have you no recollection concerning the drait which was altered in consequence of your request or some suggestion of yours—can't you from any recollection say whether or not this is a laithful copy, so far as the sense or substance of it is concerned? A. I recollect very distinctly that there was a drait presented which, when I carefully read it over, I declined to sign, and that I made alterations or amenoments in the draft, pernaps enwote a part of it, and the paper I staned was not the first one without the alterations, but the second one after the alterations had been made; how, whether this is a copy of that first draft have no other knowledge than the mere fact that this says so.

Q. Won't you read the article that relates to yourself? Not aloud, but read it, and say whether that article is in your recollection, and, to the best of yourself? Mr. Cardinal printed for my the sound of the printed form; I cannot say, sir, that this was that draft was in the handwriting of Sammer W. Wilkeson; I do not know who was present when the original draft was shown to me; I don't remember it was a chance meeting or whether any previous appointment of the draft was in the was in the evaning.

Q. Did you, on reading or hearing read that draft on that cocasion, the interview of which i am speaking, with a view in the paper; I don

stricken out.
The judge allowed the answer to stand as it is.

The surge allowed the answer to stand as it is.

Q. Now, sir, did you then and there, after this statement which you were ready to sign a dozen or twenty times over, did you then and there propose, by movement or words, to actually sign the paper at that moment? A. I remember expressing my willingness to sign such a paper, and made a motion like this (illustrating), and said I would sign it twenty times over.

EVARIS PAILS TO SECURE HIS POINT.

I do not think I saw the paper at all, and I do not remember distinctly whether the two concluding paragraphs were read or not; I don't remember whether the remaining portion was read or not; I remember the impression made on my mind when that language and glowing paragraph was put into Mr. Bowen's mouth, of retraction, and I said, "If Mr. Bowen will sign that I will do it twenty times over;" whether the remaining clause was then read I don't know; I know that as soon as the document was passed before me for my signature I refused to sign it.

Mr. Evarts—Wedi, now I won't take that answer. I ask to nave it struck out.

The sudge—I think it may stand.

Mr. Evarts—Vour Honor will be so good as to note my objection,
Q. Do you mean to say, Mr. Tilton, that when

note my objection,
Q. Do you mean to say, Mr. Tilton, that when
you heard or knew of only the part that aflected Mr. Bowen's signature you were ready to ign?
Counsel for the plaintiff objected to this ques-tion, but it was finally ruled in order by the

Judge.

Witness continued—My recollection is that I

Witness continued—My recollection is that I burst in with the extravagant expression that if Mr. Bowen would retract his words and blot them out I was willing to sign it twenty times over; my impression is that the paper was brought there irest that day, possioly by Mr. Claffin, and the purport of their inquiry was this:—in case Mr. Bowen would sign such a paper, would I sign it? I said, If Mr. Bowen will, then I certainly will, twenty times over.

Q. Now, will you answer the question, what prevented you signing It? A. I don't think anything prevented me; if I had chosen to sign it i could have done so: I expressed my willingness to sign it, not my intention to sign it; I took a pen in my hand and said, "Bring me that paper and if Mr. Bowen will sign it i will sign it;" I do not remember any one saying, "Don't sign first, or penaps Mr. Bowen won't be as willing to sign a teryou;" I don't recollect anything of that sort, though Mr. Mount of will be a sign a teryou." I don't recoilect anything of that sor, though Mr. Moulton expressed a doubt; my impression is that Mr. Moulton said that he did not believe Mr. Bowen would sign it; I remember Mr. Claffin saying, "Mr. Bowen has got to sign it;" I do not remember Mr. Caffin saying, "Better not sign it before Mr. Bowen does, or perhaps he will not be willing to

Bowen does, or perhaps he will not be willing to sign after you have signed.

Q. Now, sir, do you not think that the whole of that paper was read by you, or to you that evening at that interview? A. I have already said, sir, that I don't remember whether it was or was not; this I remember, that it the whole was read the remaining paragraphs were glossed over, because I remember when reading it the next day I was struck by the extraordinary words put into my mouth; the part that I was to assume in that agreement had already been spoken of; I think Mr. Clafin came to Mr. Moulton's house; if remember having a conversation with him in Mr. remember having a conversation with him in Mr. Moulton's house; I remember having a conversation with him in Mr. Moulton's house, and I think there were two or three interviews with him before this agreement culminated; I think we had a discussion about the subject.

what became of it.

Q. Now, who took away that paper—the draft?
Did you take it away? A. I don't remember
whether I took it away; I saw it next at Wilkeson's office, a day or two after; I saw it aga n,
when I was asked to sign it, and declined to do so. A STIFF BREEZE

here sprang up between counsel, in which the Judge took a part. It blew a burricane for ten minutes. Morris, Beach, Evarts, Pullerton and the Judge got mixed up in inextricable conjusion. Evarts stood rigid as a crowbar, and held his ground bravely through the storm. Beach, Fullerton and Morris popped up in rapid succession, and though aided by a heavy broadside from the Judge falled to shake the courage of the intrepid counsel for the defence. The volume of lair judgment was against Evarts. The witness was clearly entitled to explain why, after expressing his willingness to sign the tripartite agreement, he demurred on finding dorse. The passages between Evarts and the Judge and between Evarts and the counsel for the plaintiff were sharp and exciting, and kept the audience on the "ragged edge" of apprehension. The limits of courtesy were hardly transgressed, but there was a very close approach to ill temper

on all sides.

Q. Was it the draft that was before you and Wikeson at the interview as the North Pacific Railroad office; there was some paper before you, was it the draft? A. I don't know whether it was Mr. Wikeson's draft that he proposed for me to sign or whether it was my draft of what I proposed to sign; it may have been both.

Q. Can you or not teil me whether or not Mr. Wikeson's draft which had been before you at the interview between Cafin, Moulton and himself was defore you and him at this interview at the railroad office? A. That may have been; it so then it was there in order that my proposed change should be put into it.

Q. When, it at all, was that draft taken into your possession and made the subject of amendment or change by you? A. I don't remember the exact date.

the exact date.

Bowen's Check.

Q. Now, have you a copy of that award that was made? A. Yes; it consisted of Mr. Bowen's calck for \$7.000; I believe I have it; that's the only copy.

ior \$7.000; I believe I have it; that's the only copy.

Q. You have the check? A. I don't know whether I have it; I have Bowen's money; you asked me if I had a copy of the award; I tood you the award was Bowen's check; there was no other paper; that is all care for; my impression is that all the arbitrators were present and Mr. Bowen also when I received the check; Mr. Moulton was also there; I think I took the check; Mr. Moulton was also there; I think I took the check i mm to show to my wife and that I handed it to Franklin Woodruff the next day or the day after.

Q. Now, have you any draft or record of any change you made in fuls original draft? A. No, sir; but Mr. Winkeson has; he has the paragraph which I proposed; it was in my handwriting; I displaced his paragraph and substituted one of my own.

Q. He did have it at the time? A. Yes, sir; and

he copied from that, and he made a clean copy in his own handwriting.

Q. Then the article relating to this tricartite agreement is in your own language? A. I don't know whether it is entirely in my own language. My recollection is—if you will hand me the book—that I adopted a part of Mr. Wilkeson's paragraph.

and disposed, some people to sneer. Evarts thought

My recollection is—if you will hand me the book—that I adopted a part of Mr. Wilkeson's paragraph.

Q. I mean to say that the paragraph as it appears is as you presented it in shape? A. I don't think I composed the entire paragraph; I think I took his composition; my recollection is that the whole paragraph which I proposed and signed was handed over to me; a clean copy was made of the covenant which I copied in my own handwriting.
Q. Now, when you presented this paragraph for insertion was the copy ready for signature there in your presence? A. That I don't remember.

SIGNING THE AGREEMENT.

Q. Do you remember whether the parties were together when it was signed—you signed it in the presence of each other? A. I remember they were never all together; my impression is Mr. Beecher signed it first; I signed it next; I wrote my name over his, and Mr. Beecher signed it over mine, fulfilling the Scripture injunction. "The first shall be last and the last shall be first;" there was only one copy; that was the understanding, but that understanding was not kept; Mr. Wilkeson kept a single copy and alterward published it windout authority; there was a solemn understanding that there should be only one copy, but that understanding was proken; only one paper was signed.

Q. Was tellivered to him in your presence? A. I don't remember.

Q. In whose hands did you leave it when you signed it? A. My best regollection is the content of the collection.

Q. Was it delivered to him in your presence? A. I don't remember.
Q. In whose hands did you leave it when you signed it? A. My best recollection is that it was pernaps Charles Storrs, possibly Frank Mouiton; Charles Storrs was one of the arbitrators; my memory is too indistinct to answer that; my impression is that the paper ingered for several days before all the signatures were made; whether Charles Storrs or Mr. Moulton got them I don't know.

charles Storrs of Mr. Moulton got them 1 don't know.
Q. Now, sir, do you remember whether or no you had received the check of Mr. Bowen before you signed this paper? A. I received the check of Mr. Bowen on the hight of the arbitration; I do not think that the paper was signed until a few days

Bowen on the fight of the artitration; I do not think that the paper was signed until a few days after that.

Q. Are you certain of that, sir? A. I think I am positive of that, sir.

Q. Upon reflection can you or not recall whether you had not signed that paper and were without your money after it was signed? A. No, sir; no such incident occurred; that was Mr. Wilkeson's statement, and it was a falsehood put before the investigating Committee; Mr. Wilkeson published a statement of the fact that declined to sign the tripartite covenant because Mr. Bowen had not paid me; that was a lie; Mr. Bowen paid me within half an hour of the srottration.

Q. Now, your recollection is distinct that you had the check being you signed the paper? A. My recollection is this, sir, that the check was paid to me on the very night of the arbitration and that the paper was signed some days afterward—first one signature, then another and then another; my impression is that my signature was two or three days after I had this discussion with Mr. Wilkeson about the paragraph I was to sign.

Q. Are you certain that you received the check before you signed that paper? A. Yes, sir; because the paper was not signed till afterward.

Q. Now you say you cannot remember when or where you signed the paper? A. I don't remember the exact spot, no, sir; I remember that there was a discussion that followed it—two or three days.

Q. Nor the exact time? A. No, sir; I only re-

days.

Q. Nor the exact time? A. No, sir; I only remember this very distinctly, that the signing of that paper had nothing to do with the arbitration or the payment of the money. (Stricken out.) "I distinctly remember that the signing of that paper (the tripartite agreement) had nothing

to do with the arbitration of my claim on Bowen and the payment of the \$7,000." This statement was volunteered by the witness and was stricker out. A great craning of necks occurred in the admission on the part of the witness, but he sailed over the troubled waters in salety.

Mr. Evarts (to piantiff's counsel)—Now, gentlemen, have you the pages of the "True Story," as it is called?
Mr. Morris—We have not got them. Mr. Tilton thinks he has them among his papers. I have not

Mr. Morris—We have not got them. Mr. Tilton thinks he has them among his papers. I have not them,
Mr. Evarts—I ask now, if Your Honor please, from the counsel and the piaintif, the production of the preserved pages of the "frue story," I gave them notice to produce them yesterday, that I should need them this morning.
Mr. Beach—They might have been produced. Mr. Morris—I haven't them in my possession. Witness—I will give them to you at two o'clock. Mr. Evarts—We pass, then, if Your Honor pleases, to another subject.

The BOWEN LETTER.
Q. Now, Mr. Tilton, you prepared for publication, or put in type, the Bowen letter, with comments, you remember? A. Yos, sir; the date of its preparation was toward the end of March, 1872; I don't know that I showed it to anybody after It was in type; I discussed it with Oilver Johnson; It was put in shp form: Mr. Moulton showed it to Mr. Beecher; I think I subject at the time; I do not remember showing it to any person outside of may own counsel; I think I subject to Judge Reynolds; afterward a number of people saw it; my impression is that nobody saw it until after the Woodhuil publication in November, and i was a part of the tripartite agreement—an article.
Q. How early in the progress of the tripartite agreement did you show it to Mr. Wilkeson. A. I don't remember.
Q. Did you show it to Mr. Wilkeson. A. I

agreement did you show it to Mr. Wilkeson. A. I don't remember.

Q. Did you show it to him before it came to be a part of the tripartite agreement, before the text of the tripartite agreement had been presented? A. Why, of course; how otherwise could it have been made a part of the agreement? there was one arbitration, and that was the one a few days before; it was ended by the award.

Q. Had you then any suit pending, or had any been commenced against Mr. Bowen? A. Yes, sir.

Q. In what court? A. Weil, I don't know; one of these courts; perhaps this one; Mr. Ward com-

menced a suit in my absence.
Q. Weil, there was a suit pending which had been commenced during your absence? A. I don't know whether it was a suit or whether you call it supplementary proceedings; is that a suit to take

supplementary proceedings; is that a suit to take testimony?

Q. Well, I have heard of a young lawyer beginning a suit by issuing a f. fa. but your view of the matter is there was a suit pending? A. There was a suit or some proceedings.

Q. Some proceedings at law for the collection of the amount; that is your notion? Yes, sir.

Q. Now, who did you show that letter to in December—this article including the Bowen letter or sip? A. I don't remember that I showed it to anybody merely as an article by itself, but only in connection with weat was called "The true

anybody merely as an article by itself, but only in connection with wear was called "The true story;" perhaps I did show it to Mr. Belcher; I think I did, to Mr. Samuel Belcher.

WHAT BECAME OF THE SLIFTS?

Q. Now, I am not inquiring about anything at present except this article, as put in some form of tipe by itsel; now, you taink you showed it to Mr. Belcher? A. Yes, sir.

Q. And in this same time in December? A. I don'; remember; it may have been earlier than that.

And in this same time in December? A. I don't remember; it may have been earlier than that.

Q. Do you know how mady slips were printed? A. Three, I taink; I alterward learned that the printer had one; I afterward learned that the printer had one; I afterward learned that the printer had one; I afterward learned that a copy had been dropped, as I was told, from my pocket in the printing onice; whether that was time I can't say; a printed slip had been shown to the Rey. Dr. Freid, the editor of the New York Evangelist, whose printing office was on the next floor above hithe.

Q. Very well: now what became of the three slips? A. One went to Mr. Whikeson and is embodied in the tripartite covenant and is here in court, and one is in our posses-ion, with Mr. Johnson's amendments; I think there was only one completed slip; one coly was picked up by the printer. I think that was an incomplete copy, except so far as Mr. Johnson's handwriting; I think the one in type.

Q. Now, Mr. Thion, did you loan one of those slips to Mr. John W. Harmon's A. Yes, sir, I did after the Woodhull scandal; Mr. Harmon is a very intimate triend of mine, and I consulted with him irequently; I showed him a slip and committed it to his discretion; I did not say to him I didn't care what he did with it; I cared a good deal what he did with it; Mr. Harmon had it two or three times, and on one occasion a genieman from the newspaper offices called upon me and wanted very much to see that proof; I did not snow it to him; after that he told me Mr. Harmon's house with the proof; Mr. Harmon wasn't there, and I let it with him; I left it at his house encased in a note; I don't what he are the told me Mr. Harmon's house with the proof of the town that the Eagle had possession of the scandal, which it might publish; I do not know that any threats were made: I would not call them threats, it was gossip; I know a Mr. McDermott, connected with the Brookipy press of the

THE DAY OF JUDGMENT.

Q. Do you remember his saying to you in advance of the publication of it in the Sunday Press or the Eagle that he was going to publish it? Are you quite suite that Mr. McDermott did not tell you in advance that the publication was going to be made? A. Yes, as certain as the Judgment Day will come.

made? A. Yes, as certain as the Judgment Day will come.

Q. That is a future event. You should say you are sure. A. That is one of those things which we ail are certain of—the day of the Almighty—

Q. Still it is in the minre. A. The Great I Am.

Q. You mean by that you are entirely certain that he old not tell you? A. I aid not know Mr. McDermott; did not know him until he came into my office, presenting his card, after the publication; I asked him if he was the man that published that article; he said he was, and I ordered him out of the office; I never could comprehend until a few days ago now that site came to be published; when I saw Mr. Kinsella's correspondence published he said in that that Mr. Beecher had shown to him a tripartite covenant, or, at all events. Mr. Bowen delied it, and I saw there an explanation of how, possibly, the Eagle might have got hold of the article.

"You are certain that McDermott did not call

"You are certain that McDermott did not call

and disposed some people to sneer. Evaris thought of in sinuating a doubt, and said that was a thing of the juture, to which the witness replied, "The great I am is aiways present." A curious effect was produced by this style of address, delivered in a deep, sepulchral tone, as if to irighten the court room into propriety.

in a deep, sepulchrai tone, as it to irighten the court room into propriety.

AIT. Evarts (to the Court)—We will have the "true story" here at two o'clock, and until that time i will occupy the space with some things admitted.

Q. Do you remember, Mr. Tilton, whether or no you left off going to Plymouth church—had leit off or did leave off then going to Plymouth church—as early as the year 1896? A. No. Sir. i west occasionally all the way down to the spring of 1870.

Q. Now, how often did you go in 1866? A. I don't remember.

Q. Did you go more than twice in that whole year? A. Yes, sir.

Q. Did you go more than two or three times? A. Oh, yes, i did, down to the spring of 1870.

Q. You did go occasionally in 1866? A. Yes, sir, and in 1867, 1865 and 1869.

Q. Now, did you go more than two or three times in that year? A. Well, I don't remember; I would say perhaps I went eight or nine times; perhaps it may have been ten.

Q. Now, in the year 1867 did you go at all, and if at all, did you go more than two or three times? A. I cannot say how many times.

Q. And in the year 1868 what was your habit of attending that canron? A. I think I went to church about as other people do.

Q. There is a great difference as to the irequency with which people to to church: I would rather have your personal recollection? A. My recollection is that I went to Plymouth church with more or less irequency who many times in the year; I was in the habit of lecturing five months in the year; then Plymouth church was closed during two other months of the year.

Q. We needn't argue about it; the fact I want to know is whether you went in 1863 more than two or three times to Plymouth church? A. I went with more or less frequency up to the year.

Q. Will you teil me how many times.

Q. Will you teil me how many times.

went with more or less frequency up to the year 1870.

Q. Will you tell me how many times you went?

A. I do not know how many times.

Q. And so in the year 1869 did you then go more than two or three times? A. I taink I shall have to make the same answer to that; I don't know how many times.

Q. You have said, Mr. Thiton, in regard to your visits at Mrs. Woodhull's house, that you never passed but one night there; now how late in the night have you been there on other occasions?

A. I should say eleven o'clock perhaps: I went all over the house once, in order that Mrs. Woodhull might show that every room was empty and barren of furniture; there was only one room occupied in it, and that was her room, her husband's study and a room occupied by Mr. Andre Ms.

Q. When was that? A. I don't remember the date; in the early part of my acquaintance with her; she wanted me to go there to the house and see that there was nothing in it; it was as bare as a new nouse; there was only one room furnished; that was the parior.

Q. Did it continue to be in this condition during the whole period of your visiting there? A. I don't remember; never went upstairs but that once.

Q. And that is all that you know about it. I

the whole period of your visiting there? A. I don't remember; never went upstairs but that once.

Q. And that is all that you know about it. I understain you? A. That is all I know about it, yes sir; she told me that her house had been called a house of ill-repute, and she wanted me to see that it was totally unoccupied, and there was no article of furniture in it from the top to bottom, only the room which she and her husband occupied, and the room Mr. Andrews occupied, and there was one which, I think, her mother and her sister occupied; however, it was a great, empty, barren house; that was one of the circumstances that impressed me with the idea that she was a traduced woman.

Q. Weil, aid you understand whether it had been stripped by an execution or anything of that kind?

A. No, sir; I simply understood that it was an unoccupied house—that is to say, an uniurnished house.

Q. And had always been so? A. I never asked

A. No, sir; I simply understood that it was an unoccupied house.

Q. And had always been so? A. I never asked any question about it; never thought on the subject from that day to this.

Q. Do you mean to say that you don't know that it was ever refurnished? A. I don't know anything about it; never neard anything about it; I don't know whether it was or not: I never knew, never understood anything about it.

Q. Do you mean it was or not: I never knew, never understood anything about it.

G. Now, now early after the publication of the Bacon letter by you—your letter to Dr. Bacon—how early after that did any more papers or copies of lapers which had been in Mr. Moulton's hands conaccted with the matter come into your hands; I had is to say, when I made my sword statement, which was a month after the Bacon letter, I then had no access to the papers; then they were published in Mr. Beccher's statement; they never came into my possession; I have seen the papers since this suit has gone on.

Q. Wei, the question, Mr. Thoon, is this:—How soon after the papers themselves that had been in Mr. Moulton's possession, or copies or them, which were not already in your possession. come in o your lands; now, do you say they never did? A. I don't understand your question, Mr. Evarts.

Q. Now, how soon after you published the Bacon letter did any papers that were not before that that in your hands, or any copies of papers that wert not belove that time in your hands, or have copies of papers that that ha belong in that time in your hands, did the papers that were in Mr. Moulton's hands come into your possession?

How Tillfon MADE His STATEMEN.

Willess—I don't remember that any mapers or

papers that were in Mr. Moulton's hands come into pur possession?

HOW TILTON MADE HIS STATEMENT.

Witees—I don't remember that any papers or copie of papers came into my possession from Mr. Moulton's nands at ail; Mr. Moulton published in his o'n statement the documents which he had.

Q. to copies came from Moulton's A. I recollect ery distinctly going to Mr. Moulton's before the Byorn statement was prepared, and he define to let me have them.

Q. hat you remember distinctly? A. Yes, sir; I hadto make my statement upon the measure materins I had in my saie.

Q. tow, str. If you will refresh your recollection

terms I had in my saic.
Q. tow, sir, If you will refresh your recollection by loking at that hast clause? A. Yes, sir.
Q. tow, sir, took at that, will you, and tell me wherthe papers and copies of capters that you therefreer to came into your nands? A. Will you allowne to read this sentence?
Q. tertainly.
Witess (reading)—"I had with the original collients here, for the most part in my possession.

doculents here, for the most part in my possession.

Q. ow, before the papers you there refer to, how ing had they oeen in possession? A. Why, ever ince they had been written.

Q. tad you not, when you were preparing your statement for the committee, received from Mr. Month any papers or copies of papers which up to that time you had not in your possession? A. No, s; Mr. Monton—

Q. ery well, that is all.

Whees (continuing)—Mr. Moulton would not let in nave them, that is—

Q. vei, the had is that between the time of the publication of the Bacon letter and the time you madyour sworn statement that you did not receivenly of the documents? A. No, sir, Mr. Moulton was very angry about it, and reinsed.

The usual recess until two o'clock was then take:

Thetitness was on exhibition in the chair for a quarr of an hour before the proceedings were resume. Mr. Evarts was the cause of the delay. He was string his ammunition together and it finally appeted in the shape of "the True Statement," whic was read piecemeal to a profoundly at-

whice was read piecemeal to a proloundly attents audience.

Thirdn's true story.

They trees said, in reply to Mr. Evarts—I have proceed papers in reference to the "True Story;" they be not parts of the drait; they are part of the cy; there are some blains in them, blanks not led up in what I have called the "compiete copy! the "complete" copy and never been according to empleted; these are all that I have been ble to flad, all that I know of being now in existee; every scrap; there is no copy of any of tarest that I know of.

Q. r. Tilton, please listen to what I shall now read on, and say whether you recognize it as the committeement of this "True Story." (Reading):—Onday last menth, when I was in porthern New Hamsire, a scansialous publication burst lk: a cloud over a nome in strocklyn, and shed a stadden shadow on myite's good name.

Mrivarts—Do you remember that as the first sentee in your "True Story!" A. I don't rememir that precise phraecology, but something of the kind; I can't positively swear to these exactories.

Mrivarts then read the statement sentence by sentce, the witness assenting to nearly all of the atement.

Q. About ten or eleven years ago Henry C. Bowl. for whom I was then working as subordiate in the Independent office, told me one everg, when crossing the Fulton lerry, that Heil Ward Beecher was guilty of admirery, and this grain in Indianapolis and was continued in Brdiyn." Do you remember that? A. I don't remember that as a part of the statement; I remeder Mr. Bowen teiling me that.

Nevarts (continuing to read):—

Fing a part of this time Mr. Beecher was the editor in large of the Independent and I was lieutenant. Alwards he retired and I succeeded to the chair, Be before Mr. Beecher's retirement and afterward Mr. Bowen teiling me that.

Nevarts (continuing to read):—

Fing a part of this time Mr. Beecher was the editor in large of the Independent of the chair. Be defore Mr. Beecher's retirement and afterward Mr. was in the habit of saving. The pastor of Plymid church was a dangerous

Do you recognize that sentence? A. No, sir; I on't remember that sentence accurately eight to swear to it.

Evarts then read: i. Evarts then read:—

a forther statement still more unwillingly open, yearcssary to the expirancion of the subsequent combition of circumstances, I must say that in the summer out, a few months after I had undertaken, in adaition toling the Independent, the editing also of the Brooklys Uh, Mrs. Elizabeth R. Titton, my wife, made to me a comunication concerning Mr. Beecher, which, to use her own words, lest I should wrong him by using mine, she afterward noted down in a memorandum, as iollows: "Mr. ii. W. Beccher".—

she afferward noted down in a memorandum, as tollows: "Mr. it. W. Beecher"—

On this question a long legal argument ensued, in which Mr. Fullerton, Mr. Evarts, and Mr. Beach took part. Mr. Fullerton objected, contending that they ought to know whether counsel on the other side had before them the true statement. That would speak for itself, if produced. Mr. Evarts thought he was in order in asking these questions from the paper before him.

Judge Neilson—I think, in view of the circumstances that the paper was in the hands of Mrs. Tilton, and understood to have been destroyed, and there is a small portion finally found, and only a portion, and this witness is ignorant of any more, he may take this course whether he has got the correct copy or not.

Mr. Fullerton—They are not reading from the fragments: they are showing something else. It may be something else in the shape of copy. That is the difficulty about it.

The Judge—I think we will go on, gentlemen. Take an exception.

Mr. Evar:s—Now, I must begin again the sentence that was incomplete:—

Ass further statement still more unwillingly opened.

As a further statement still more unwillingly opened, yet necessary to an explanation of the subsequent complication of circumstances.

Witness—I don't understand it.

Mr. Everts—continued in the statemeut, stall more unwillingly opened."

Mr. Everts—continued it.

Mr. Everts—"Opened." "As a further statement, still more unwillingy opened."

Witness—I don't understand It.

Mr. Evert's (continuing)—
Yet necessary to an explanation of the subsequent combineation of circumstances. I must say that in the summer of 1570, a few months after I had understaken, in addition to editing the Independent, to edit site the Brooklyn Dinon, Mrs. Elizabeth R. Thion, my wife, made to me a communication concerning Mr. Beecher, which, to use her own words, lest I should wrome him by using my own, she afterward noted down in a memorandum so that the subset of the most of the state of the st

the initials; I wrote the names in full if I wrote it at all; I did not do it in that blind way; I cannot swear positively.

Mr. Evaris (reading)—"During the summer of the year 1870 i spoke of the case to a few friends and expressed more anger rather than charity toward Mr. Beocher; though toward Mr. Bowen, whose two papers I was editing, I was slent, being unwilling to add any more fuel to his anger against the man he was willing to destroy;" now, do you remember that?

Mr. Evarts (reading)—

My wie's mother now began to play an important part in my relations to Mr. Bowen and Mr. Becener, and in relation to these persons to each other. This lay was for years in a chronic state of apprehension and nervousness, and one of our physicians the late Dr. Barker, of Brooklyn, recommended, several years ago, that she be taken and sent to an institution for the insane. Among her eccentricities—which are alluded to not to reproach their author, whom disears should larrely exonograte from consure—was an attempt about that time, frequently, to take the lie of her husband, Hon. Nathan B. Morst, by clutching his throat and stranging him with such powerfur clutch that her graps was loosened with such powerfur clutch that her graps was loosened ration between her husband and herself.

Mr. Tilton (interrupting)—I stated "cutting" his throat, sir.

Mr. Evarts—No, "clutching."

extinguished with chloroform, resulting in a final separation between her husband and herself.

Mr. Tillton (interrupting)—I stated "cutting" his throat, sir.

Mr. Evaris—No, "clutching."

Q. Do you recognize that as a part of your statement? A. I don't remember the exact statement.

Q. And was that statement included in your statement? A. I don't remember the exact statement.

Q. And was that statement included in your statement? A. I think there was a very sharp statement of Mrs. Morse and her troubles and our troubles with her, but I do not know whether that is the one or not.

Q. "In a less degree she had used violence toward other persons, and had frequently written letters to me threatening my life."—do you recognize that? A. I don't remember that statement; I remember the tact of her threatening my life.

Q. "Her ingenuity of statement against her relations during these spasms was conning and malicious in the extreme." At the same time in saying this:—"I bear testimony to the kindness of her nature. By those who know her well her peculiarities are understood, and an acquaintance illegible) of the most peaceable and ascenating person." Bo you remember that as a part of your statement? A. No, sir; but if that blank were filled it think it would be a correct statement of the lady's character and habits.

Q. "The unhappiness she has occasioned to every member of my own ramily has increased from year to year, until at last Mrs. Tilton and I have loroid her to enter our house." Do you remember thair A. I don't remember it as a part of the statement (to the Court); if your Honor will instruct me in regard to these matters; I am constant,y recalling to myself that I am under coath, and I whish my suswers may be consistent; here is a series of sentences read to me, and I am asked whether or not I wrote several years ago such and such sentence before me and make me prove that It was what I wrote at the time; I don't wish to swear to what is not true; I now again request the writing to be just be ore me and into my

The Judge-If you recognize it as a portion of answer you do not. If you remember it in sub-stance and not in words, you may answer that way.

Mr. Evarts then questioned the witness, reading Mr. Evarts then questioned the witness. reading from the paper, as to whother for ten years he had not been on speaking terms with Mrs. Beecher, and that the cause of her nosulity was an act of kindness he (Titun) had performed for one of her children. "She never since spoke to me as a friend," The witness replied that he recognized that as like something he had written.

Q. "Mr. Beecher advised the to support Mr. E. D. Webster for Congress." Do you recognize that?

A. I do not.

Q. "I declined to support Mr. Webster. Mr. Bowen said that one way to support Mr. Webster was to dismiss its editor (editor of Brooklyn Union). Mr. Webster plames me for his deleat, and maligns me to this day." Do you recognize that? The witness was understood to answer that he did not remember any of that.

Referring to some statement which, according to the paper, Mr. Bowen had made concerning the position of his children, Mr. Evarts read:—"I took off my crown, laid it at his leet, and said God save the king." Do you recognize the king." Do you recognize the king." Do you recognize that statement?

Witness—That sounds like me. (Great laughter in court.)

to the paper, Mr. Bowen had made concerning the position of his coniden, Mr. Evarts read;—"it took off my crown, laid in at his leet, and said "God save the king." Do you recognize that statement? Witness—That sounds like me. (Great laughter in cont.)

Counsel referred, in the paper, to certain arrangements between the witness and Bowen regarding the management of Bowen's newspapers, and read, "il notified approval to Oliver Jonnson, and gave him my gold watch in proof of the love I coerished for the man." Do you, asked Counsel, recognize that?

Witness—I remember making an allusion of that kind to Mr. Johnson; in answer to this token there came a letter, from Mr. Johnson, which letter I have in my lossession.

Q. "In addition to this letter, which I cherish much, I received a git of a gold watch from Mr. Bowen to replace the one I had given away." Is that in your satement? A. Yes.

Under date of December 22, 1872, the Independent (said Mr. Evarts) contained a valedictory and response which is not here. "Mr. Johnson mentioned to me that some strange lates had been told to Mr. Bowen; that Mr. Bowen, without specifying them, was annoyed with them." Did you say that in the statement? A. I do not remember that.

Mr. Evarts (again reading from the paper) alided to some of Mrs. Morse's statements, and to the alignation therein that Bowen without specifying them, was almoyed with them." Did you make that statement?

Witness—I think that is part of the statement.

Mr. Evarts (reading)—'To be a witness there and in note the proceedings of the church. For mouths past, and protably that would not be there. My outnous i stated to him in a lew words in the presence of Mr. Johnson, my wife's communication concerning Mr. Beecher was any such bungling selected in it as that.

Mr. Evarts (reading)—'Ar. Bowen's indignation against Mr. Beecher was approach to which his paper, and my bound in the presence of the strain of the control of the strain of the relief of the words in the presence of Mr. Johnson, my wife's communication w

Titton had that day, December 26, 1870, informed him of his demand on Mr. Beecher.

Witness did remember putting that memorandum in the "True Story."

The next extract went on to recite that a day or two afferward, pompted by his wile (Mrs. Tilton), he resolved to send to Mr. Beecher to meet him, and he despatement word to Mr. Bowen informing him of his intention, and Mr. Bowen informing him of his intention, and Mr. Bowen came into the apartment where he (Tilton) was seated, the day iollowing, in a towering rage, his bearing being more of an iosane than of a rational kind; "be threatened me that if I should divuige to Mr. Beecher what he had said against him, or that he had any part in the letter caling on Mr. Beecher to vacate the pulpit, he should suspend me from the management of the paper, and he would summon a policeman and have me passed out into the streets."

Q. Was that what you wrote in the "True story?" A. That was the substance; I can't rempender all I wrote.

Q. "He sat like one in a dream." Did you write that? A. I think i did.

Q. "It is but a few squares from here to my house; go and ask Mrs. Tilton whether she wrote the letter; go and ask for yourself."

Witness—I don't remember that phraseology.

Q. "When he returned Mr. Moulton asked him what he had said, and he said he "and seen that lady;" he then left; this was about eleven o'clock at night." Do you remember that part of the story in A. I think I remember that part of the story in A. I think I remember that.

The paragraph referring to the crowning mistoriunes of that last week of December, 1870—the dismissal of Mr. Tilton by Mr. Bowen from the Independent and the Brooking Union—was then read. Witness did not remember the exact pursues of his preparation of a New Year's gift for treats of his preparation of a New Year's gift for

dismissat of Mr. Titton by Mr. Bowen from the Independent and the Brookly Union—was then read. Withese did not remember the exact pursaeology.

The next point was that in which the story treats of his preparation of a New Year's gift for Mr. Bowen in the form of the letter published—the letter of January 1, 1871; and then f-llowed the report of the conversation which Moulton had with Beecher, and which he repeated to Moulton, who look phonographic notes of it, from which he subsequently transcribed that portion for the "frue Story" at the end of two years.

Counsel then next shuded to Mrs. Davis' letter to the Springfleid Republican, repudiating the story in circulation which connected her with naving a knowledge of the libeious story against Mr. Beecher and Mrs. Titton; Mrs. Lavis was not intimately acquainted with Mrs. Titton; and met her but twice, and then Mrs. Titton, it she spoke of Mr. Beecher at all, spoke of him as a man of honor and her pastor.

Mrs. Stanton, in a letter included in the quoted story, alluded to the Woodbull story as like unto the old adage. "False in one particular, false in all." She wrote that she would stand by Mrs. Titton in the nour of need. Mrs. Titton was also quoted as "denying the story of Mrs. Davis' intimacy with her ramily; she had not met that lady for several years, and had never held any conversation with her on the Woodbull scandal."

Mr. Everts then rend the letter of Mrs. Titton to Mr. Beecher (which has been repeatedly published) denying the story of any impure intimacy with Mr. Beecher, and then followed the reading of Mr. Beecher's explicit denial of the charge of criminality.

Q. Do you know Mr. Jackson S. Schultz, of New York? A. Yes, sr: verf well.

Q. How long have, you known Mr. Schultz, of New York? A. Yes, sr: verf well.

Q. How long have, you known Mr. Schultz, of New York? A. Yes, sr: verf well.

Q. How was a subscriber to the stock of your paper was he not? A. Yes, sr: he subscribed sto the Golden Age.

BLOWING THE ROOF OFF PLYMOUTH CHURCH.

Q. Now, Mr.

settled with you? A. No; but I did not say that; the man who threatened to blow the reof et Plymouth church was Oliver Johnson. (Sensation.)

Mr. Evarts—Weil, I did not ask you for any explanation, I simply asked you the question did you say it. Did you say to Mr. Schultz on another occasion, either in substance or in lact, what I have now read? A. No, sir; I did not; my interview with Mr. Schultz was neld in the presence of Mr. Franklin Woodraff.

Q. Had you any conversation with Mr. Schults?

A. I had some conversation with him.

Mr. Evarts—Then you do remember having had a conversation with him. Where was that conversation held? A. It was at his own house in New York, where I had gone with Mr. Franklin Woodraff to see him.

Q. When was it? A. I don't recollect exactly; it was either early in January or possibly in February, 1561; I remember exactly what I said to him on that occasion, but I didn't use any such language to him.

Mr. Evarts—Well, I am not asking you that! I only want to know about this. Did you in the course of that conversation with Schultz then or at any time in 1871 or 1872, say to him, in answer to bis inquiry as to whether Mr. Becomer had spoken to you of having improper relations with your wife, "My wile is White as The Driven Snow and Pure As Aw Miller as The Driven Snow and Pure As Aw Wilness (with great emphasis and leaning forward in his chair) replied—"Yes, sir; I do." (Sensation.)

Q. Do you know Mr. Southwick? A. Yes, sir.

Q. Do you know Mr. Southwick? A. Yes, sir.

Q. Do you know Mr. Southwick? A. Yes, sir.

Q. Do you know Mr. Southwick? A. Yes, sir.

Q. Do you know Mr. Southwick? A. Yes, sir.

Q. Do you know Mr. Southwick asking you if you were not out or your mind; and do you remember replying to him, "You refer to my 'Lite of Victoria Woodhull" and his asking you if you were not out or your mind; and do you remember that no fire, and that poor creature a met who needed assistance i would aid him or her, and that poor creature came to me in Victoria Woodhull", and it know her

expect to be very long in concluding his examination of this witness.

Judge Neilson said:—I will remain here as long
as you wish, should you desire to terminate your
cross-examination to-day.

Mr. Evarts—If Your Honor requires it we will
remain as long as you wish, but the preparation of
four hours' examination is as much as I trank I
can possibly do.

The Judge said he had no desire to protract the
session in that case, and the Court was then edjourned until eleven o'clock this morning.

JERSEY CITY WATER SUPPLY.

ANOTHER EFFORT TO HAVE THE NEW RESERVOID

COMPLETED.

No municipality in the Union has suffered a much in the matter of a water supply during the past six years as Jersey City. The impurity of the vater during the summer season was plainly demonstrated by chemists of the highest reputation, including Professor Wurtz, of the Stevens institute, at Hoboken. The distributing reserver on Borgen Hill is in a filthy condition. The increasing demand is likely to exceed the supply within three years. The erection of the new reservoir was commenced live years ago, but through biundering in the original plans and estimates the work had to be floaily stopped. The depleted condition of the treasury of Jerey City, consequent upon the astounding frauds of the ring, all of whom were indicted, added to the difficulty. So far as the work has progressed it was satisfactorily performed, and when completed it will be not only a substantial and permanent improvement, but an ornament to the city. Work has been suspended for several months. A remedy is to be applied at last. Mr. Saceran has improduced a bill providing for the completion of the new reservoir. In the preamile the naccessity for the passage of the bill is pointed out. It states that it was found necessary to vary the plans, as stated in Mitchell and Bridgeford's contract, and to conform to the plans made by the chief Engineer, now on file. It is claimed that a great saving of money will be effected by the new plan, to validate which the present set is to be passed. It empowers the city to complete the southern section of the reservoir, according to the Engineer's plans, and pay for the work in the manner and at the prices fixed in the original contract, such contract to be cancelled on the completion of the section of the work named, with the consent of the contractor, whereupon all retained percentages and arrearages shall be paid, as specified in the agreement. demonstrated by chemists of the highest reputation, including Professor Wurtz, of the Stevens

STEAMER ASHORE.

PROBABLE TOTAL WRECK OF THE PRENCH STEAMER MONTEZUMA. The steamship Acapulco, of the Pacific Steam

ship Company, which arrived at this port vester

day, reports that after leaving Port Mayet she steered north, half west, for Castle Island, and that when abreast of that island the lighthouse keeper came out to her and reported that the French steamer Montezuma, laden with coffee, bound from Port an Prince to St. Nazaire, a po. to if france, was sanore on the Great inagua island, and that the greater part of her cargo had been ost, but no account had been received of the loss of any lives, nor was it known that the steamer had on board any passengers. The Montezuma belongs to the French Colonial line that runs from St. Nazaire to Aspinwall, out coss not make the energy trip, being used more as a branch steamer to connect with the through line. She was not a large vessel, but considered a good seagoing craft, and, as the coast is not a dangerous one, the officers of the Araputico are at a loss to know now she should be ashore upon that island, and are of the opinion that, as the weather was five, she must have gone further to the northward and struck upon the lattle langua Island, a rather dangerous spot, and one upon which a number of vessels have been lost. Further particulars the officers of the Acapulco coule not learn, but it is thought that full particulars will reach this port vessels now nearly due. The general impression prevails that the entire freight of the Montezuma consisted of about 10,000 bags of codec, likiy inkeeper came out to her and reported that the